



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,408

12/05/2003

Jon Swanson

0920.68319

9759

24978 7590 09/15/2009

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN
300 S WACKER DR
25TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, FOLASHADE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/728,408	Applicant(s) SWANSON, JON	
	Examiner FOLASHADE ANDERSON	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/11/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-20, & 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-20, & 22-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action reopens prosecution in the instant application based on argument made in the Appeal Brief filed June 11, 2009.

For clarity of the record the claims under examination are those presented in Applicant's amendment filed July 22, 2008. Claims 1-17, 19, 20 and 22-37 are pending and claims 18 and 21 are canceled.

Please note the Advisory Action mailed on March 2, 2009 states that the amendments filed after the final rejection *would not be entered*. Applicant notes on page 5, footnote 1 of the Appeal Brief that "[i]t is assumed that the amendments to claim[s] 1, 4, 6, 7, 36 and 37 will be entered." It appears that the Advisory Action's explanation of the Examiner's opinion with respect to the amendments made in response to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of the final action mailed on November 24, 2008 was poorly articulated and therefore misunderstood by the Applicant. The "additionally" statement in the last paragraph of 11 of the advisory action was intended as an aside to indicate that the amendments filed in the after final to claim 6 would overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection if the amendments had been entered.

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on June 11, 2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. Non-final rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

Art Unit: 3623

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623

Response to Arguments

3. Note arguments addressed are those submitted in the Appeal Brief dated June 11, 2009. The claims to reviewed with respect to the June 11th arguments are those submitted in the Amendment dated July 22, 2008.
4. Applicant's arguments that Semaan (US Patent 5,680,392) fails to disclose
 - a. allocating a network interface location for a meeting after receiving a first request to join the meeting as recited by independent claims 1 and 31
 - b. communicating a meeting invitation that includes a meeting entry portal as recited by independent claims 1 and 31
 - c. determining available bandwidth as recited by claims 11, 12, 34 and 35.
 - d. directing users with insufficient bandwidth to link to a subset of the plurality of data streams as recited by claim 12.
 - e. an executable meeting invitation as recited by claim 14.
 - f. communicating a meeting invitation including a URL meeting entry portal as recited by claim 27
 - g. determining available bandwidth recited by claims 6-11
 - h. allocating a network interface location for a meeting after receiving a first request to join the meeting as recited by claim 28
 - i. communicating a meeting invitation that includes a meeting entry portal as recited by claim 28
5. With respect to Applicant's arguments, (5a) – (5g) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon

Art Unit: 3623

further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection are made in the updated rejection below

6. With respect to Applicant's arguments (5h) and (5i) the limitations argued are not found in the claim language of claim 28, clarification is requested.

7. It is noted that the applicant did not challenge the officially cited facts in the previous office action(s) therefore those statements as presented are herein after prior art. Specifically it has been established that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention that:

Examiner takes Official Notice that specifying an early join time before a start time before which an attendee cannot join a meeting is an old and well known function of scheduling online/virtual meetings. See claim 28.

Claim Objections

8. The amendment filed 07/22/2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: “wherein all of said attendees at either of said first and second virtual meetings are not present in the other of said first and second virtual meetings”, see claims 7, 10, 36 and 37.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

9. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: It appears that words are missing for the claim “allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees, said network resources including at least a network interface location for connecting said plurality of attendees for communication with one another during the meeting”. It is not clear what the request to join is in regards to; therefore it is assumed that Applicant means the request is to join the meeting as indicated in the previous line of the claim. Suggested correction of the limitation is “after receiving said request to join the meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees, said network resources including at least a network interface location for connecting said plurality of attendees for communication with one another during the meeting”. Appropriate correction is required.

10. Claim 4 objected to because of the following informalities: as currently amended recites “a method as defined by claim 3 and further including the step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for

Art Unit: 3623

each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees”.

It appear that Applicant overlooked the deletion of the “and” after the “3”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claims 7, 10, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically Applicant has amended claims 7, 10, 36 and 37 to include "wherein all of said attendees at either of said first and second virtual meetings are not present in the other of said first and second virtual meetings."

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
15. Claim 6 recites the limitation "said at least one meeting attendee" in the fifth line of claim 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 7-10 depend from claim 6 and therefore suffer similar deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-5, 11-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392) in view of Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1).

As per claim 1, Semaan discloses a method for organizing a virtual meeting between a plurality of attendees on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a meeting date, a meeting start time, meeting duration, and a meeting code, storing said meeting date, said meeting start time, said meeting duration, and said meeting code in a meeting file (col. 6, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 45-50; Figure 3);

storing said meeting file in a memory accessible to the network (Figures 3-4);

communicating a meeting invitation to said plurality of attendees over the network, said invitation including at least said meeting date, said meeting start time, said meeting code, and a meeting entry portal (col. 8, lines 51-64);

receiving a request to join the meeting from a first of plurality of attendees (col. 6, lines 20-52):

said network resources including at least a network interface location for connecting said plurality of attendees for communication with one another during the

Art Unit: 3623

meeting (col. 6, lines 20-52), said network resources sufficient to communicate a plurality of real time data streams over the network, said plurality of real time data streams including at least one real time video data stream and at least one real time audio data stream (col. 6, lines 24-52; col. 8, lines 65-67).

Semaan does not teach

communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal and allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees

Haims teaches in the analogous art of facilitating online communications, communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal (par. 0094, where it is old and well known that a link is a type of enter portal)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan the communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal as taught by Haims since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Haims does not teach allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees

Gorsuch teaches in the analogous art of dynamic bandwidth allocation, allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees (col. 2, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan and Haims the allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 2, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the step of determining a required bandwidth for the meeting and storing said required bandwidth in said meeting file (col., 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 3, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting, and wherein the method further includes the step of determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 4, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 3 and Semaan further discloses including the step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each

of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 5, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 4 and Semaan further discloses wherein said plurality of real time data streams includes at least a plurality of video data streams and at least one audio data stream (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 11, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting, of determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting (col. 6, lines 8-13 and 24-26; col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 12, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Gorsuch further discloses including the steps of determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting (col. 8, 37-40), of determining the total available bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 6, lines 59-63), and of directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting (col. 10, lines 37-32).

As per claim 13, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said meeting file further includes at least one application to be used during the meeting (col. 8, lines 11-31).

As per claim 14, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Haims further discloses wherein said invitation is an executable file that upon execution takes all steps necessary to connect to said virtual meeting (par. 0094).

As per claim 15, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said meeting file further specifies a display template for displaying video streams during the meeting (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 16, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 15 and Semaan further discloses wherein said display template includes application geometry for displaying images (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 17, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the step of selecting a display template for displaying at least one video data stream during the meeting (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 19, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of linking each remaining of said plurality of users to said meeting resources when a request for entry is received from said remaining of said plurality of users (col. 6, lines 44-64).

As per claim 20, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources include at least one network interface having an address, and further including storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (col. 5, lines 38-58).

As per claim 22, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein the step of allocating said network resources for said meeting comprises selecting said network resources from a list of available network resources (col. 6, lines 20-43; Figures 4-4a).

As per claim 23, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources comprise one or more network interface locations (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 24, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 23 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network interface locations comprise port numbers (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 25, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources comprise at least one IP address for a network interface connected to the network and at least one port (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 26, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources include at least one network interface address, and further including the step of storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 27, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Haims further discloses wherein said meeting entry portal is a URL and wherein said network interface location is different for said meeting entry point (par. 94).

As per claim 29, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the step of providing a network address for each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 30, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of creating a pass key for entry to said meeting, of including said pass key with said invitation communicated to said plurality of attendees, and of storing said pass key in said meeting file (col. 8, lines 60-61).

Claims 31-37 recite subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected above. Therefore, claims 31-37 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-27 and 29-30 above.

18. Claim 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392), Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1), as applied above in view of Etorre et al (U.S. 6,594,265)

As per claim 6, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 Gorsuch further discloses the steps of determining the total bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees (col. 10, lines 23-26) as well as information about outside traffic (col. 9, lines 4-10); however Gorsuch does not expressly teach through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said at least one meeting attendee to the virtual meeting.

Etorre teaches each of said plurality of attendees through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said at least one meeting attendee to the virtual meeting (Col. 25, lines 19-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch the consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated as taught by Etorre since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 7, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses wherein the virtual meeting is a first virtual meeting and wherein the step of determining the total bandwidth to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees includes determining whether a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and where in all of said attendees at either of said first and second virtual meetings are not present in the other of said first and second virtual meetings, (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28; col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; Figure 5).

As per claim 8, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 7 and Semaan further discloses wherein least one of said plurality of attendees is linked to the network by a linkage shared by an attendee of said second

virtual meeting, said second virtual meeting being at least partially concurrent with said first virtual meeting (col. 9, lines 6-9; col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; Figure 5).

As per claim 9, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of:

determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with and determining whether any additional of said plurality of attendees are connected to the network over said linkage (col. 12, lines 15-54).

As per claim 10, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses wherein the virtual meeting is the first virtual meeting and further including the steps of:

determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with, determining whether any other virtual meetings are occurring at least partially concurrently with the first virtual meeting, wherein all of said attendees at either of said first and second virtual meetings are not present in the other of said first and second virtual meetings; and determining whether any attendees of any of said other virtual meetings are connected to the network over said linkage (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; col. 12, lines 15-54).

19. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392) Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1), as applied above, and Blinken et al. (U.S. 4,796,293).

As per claim 28, Semaan does not expressly disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the step of specifying an early join time before said start

Art Unit: 3623

time before which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting and a late time after which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting. Blinken et al. discloses that "latecomers" will not be able to join a conference after a certain amount of time has expired (col. 7, lines 18-21). Additionally, Examiner takes Official Notice that specifying an early join time before a start time before which an attendee cannot join a meeting is an old and well known function of scheduling online/virtual meetings. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the online conference scheduling system of Semaan with the features taught by Blinken et al. and Official Notice because the invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yang et al (US Patent 7,353,252 B1) and Decker et al US Publication 2005/0058088 A1) teach reservationless online conferencing systems. Digate et al (US Patent 7,149,288) teaches meeting invitations that include URLs. Mangill et al (US Patent 6,606,297 B1) teaches need bandwidth. Shaffer et al (US Patent 7,035,203) teaches determining available bandwidth.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FOLASHADE ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3331. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Folashade Anderson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623